Case 2:19-cv-04266-GJP Document 1 Filed 09/17/19 Page 1 of 19 The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DEFENDANTS Joseph Dean and Patricia Dean Philadelphia Gas Works and Craig White and Joseph Cipparone (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia Philadelphia County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. SE THE LOCATION O KEVIN A !! WINYS & !! E Say In Address, and Telephone Number) Attorneys (If Known) 1500 JFK Blvd, Suite 1525, Philadelphia 215-587-0006 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plainti, (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) U.S. Government Federal Question DEF DEF PTF Plaintiff (Ù.S. Government Not a Party) Citizen of This State **1**  $\Box$  1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4  $\Box$  4 of Business In This State U.S. Government Div ersity Citizen of Another State 2 Incorporated and Principal Place  $\square$  2 **D** 5 CJ 5 Defendant Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) of Business In Another State Citizen or Subject of a  $\Box$  3 3 Foreign Nation **O** 6 □ 6 Foreign Country NATURE OF SUIT (Hace an "X" in One Box Only) Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions CONTRACT FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES ☐ 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 625 Drug Related Seizure 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 365 Personal Injury of Property 21 USC 881 ### 423 Withdrawal 🗇 376 Qui Tam (31 USC ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 315 Airplane Product □ 690 Other Product Liability 28 USC 157 3729(a)) 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability ☐ 367 Health Care/ 400 State Reapportionment 150 Recovery of Overpayment 320 Assault, Libel & Pharmaceutical PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ 410 Antitrust & Enforcement of Judgment Slander Personal Injury ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 430 Banks and Banking 330 Federal Employers ☐ 151 Medicare Act Product Liability ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Liability 368 Asbestos Personal 835 Patent - Abbreviated ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 340 Marine Student Loans Injury Product New Drug Application 3 470 Racketeer Influenced and (Excludes Veterans) ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability 840 Trademark Corrupt Organizations ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment PERSONAL PROPERTY Liability LABOR SOCIAL SECURIT 480 Consumer Credit of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 370 Other Fraud 710 Fair Labor Standards 7 861 HIA (1395ff) 485 Telephone Consumer 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle 371 Truth in Lending Act ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) Protection Act 190 Other Contract Product Liability ☐ 720 Labor/Management □ 380 Other Personal ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 490 Cable/Sat TV 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Property Damage Relations O 864 SSID Title XVI 3 850 Securities/Commodities/ ☐ 196 Franchise Injury ☐ 385 Property Damage 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) Exchange 362 Personal Injury -Product Liability 751 Family and Medical 890 Other Statutory Actions Medical Malpractice Leave Act 891 Agricultural Acts REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIONS FEDERAL TAX SUITS 790 Other Labor Litigation 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 210 Land Condemnation 440 Other Civil Rights Habeas Corpus: ☐ 791 Employee Retirement 370 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff ☐ 895 Freedom of Information ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 441 Voting 463 Alien Detainee Income Security Act or Defendant) Act ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 442 Imployment ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate ☐ 896 Arbitration 1 871 IRS—Third Party ☐ 240 Torts to Land Housing/ Sentence 26 USC 7609 ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure 245 Tort Product Liability ccommodations ☐ 530 General Act/Review or Appeal of 290 All Other Real Property Amer. w/Disabilities 535 Death Penalty IMMIGRATION Agency Decision Employment Other: 462 Naturalization Application ☐ 950 Constitutionality of Amer. w/Disabilities 540 Mandamus & Other 465 Other Immigration State Statutes Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights Actions 448 Education ☐ 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee Conditions of Confinement ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  $\mathbf{X}_{1}$ Original □ 2 Removed from  $\square$  3 Remanded from Reinstated or <sup>5</sup> Transferred from ☐ 6 Multidistrict ☐ 8 Multidistrict Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened Another District Litigation -Litigation -Direct File Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): AUSE OF ACTION 50 G Brief description of cause BROUGHT H13 DEFENDANT 10 10617101 VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION **DEMAND S** CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: FBABRA

**COMPLAINT:** 

VIII. RELATED CASE(S)

UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

AMALES SURVENDANI

IF ANY

Ø

(See instructions). JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

57 Mg

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT #

DATE

AMOUNT

APPI YING IFP

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF REFORD

MAG ILIDGE

#### 

#### FUR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM (to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar) 3331 Edgemont Street, Philadelphia, PA 19134 Address of Plaintiff: 800 west Montgomery Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122 Address of Defendant: HILADELPHIA AND VICINITY Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: RELATED CASE, IF ANY: NON B Case Number: Judge: \_ Date Terminated: Civil cases are deemed related when **Yes** is answered to any of the following questions: Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year Yes previously terminated action in this court? Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court? Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case 🔲 is / 🔟 is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only) Federal Question Cases: Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury Labor-Management Relations Other Personal Injury (Please specify): Civil Rights 7. Products Liability Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability - Asbestos Securities Act(s) Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases Social Security Review Cases (Please specify): \_ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) (evin V. Mincey, Esquire \_\_\_\_, counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs: Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

JOSEPH !	)EAN	ET UX		CIVIL ACTION	
plaintiff shall complete filing the complaint and side of this form.) In designation, that defen	e Civil Justice a Case Mar d serve a cop n the event the dant shall, wher parties, a	ce Expense and Inagement Track Inagement Track In you all defendant do not a defendant do not its first appear Case Management	Designation Forms. (See § 1:03 of ones not agree vance, submit to track Design	NO.  Plan of this court, couns in all civil cases at the tifthe plan set forth on the revith the plaintiff regarding the clerk of court and sention Form specifying the	me of everse g said eve on
SELECT ONE OF T	HE FOLLO	WING CASE M	ANAGEMENT	TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus – C	Cases brough	t under 28 U.S.C	. § 2241 through	ı § 2255.	( )
(b) Social Security – C and Human Service	Cases request es denying p	ting review of a d laintiff Social Sec	ecision of the Scurity Benefits.	ecretary of Health	( )
(c) Arbitration – Cases	s required to	be designated for	arbitration und	er Local Civil Rule 53.2.	( )
(d) Asbestos – Cases i exposure to asbesto		ims for personal i	njury or proper	ty damage from	( )
(e) Special Manageme commonly referred the court. (See rev management cases	d to as complerese side of	lex and that need	special or intens	se management by	(x)
(f) Standard Managen	nent – Cases	that do not fall in	to any one of th	ne other tracks.	(A)
Seprember 10, Date 215-587-0	2019 K	EV/NM/A Attorney-at-law 215-58	10628 _	Attorney for PLA/WI	<i>,</i> , ,
Telephone	]	FAX Number		E-Mail Address	/ K055 COM
				4	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

MINCEY FITZPATRICK ROSS, LLC KEVIN V. MINCEY, ESQUIRE ISAAC H. GREEN, ESQUIRE 1500 JFK BLVD., SUITE 1525 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102 215-587-0006

#### **ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS**

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JOSEPH DEAN 3331 Edgemont Street Philadelphia, PA 19134

and

PATRICIA DEAN 3331 Edgemont Street Philadelphia, PA 19134

**Jury Trial Demanded** 

: CIVIL ACTION NO:\_\_\_\_\_

Plaintiffs

٧.

PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS, a Corporation owned and operated by the City of Philadelphia, a Municipal government entity, having a main office located at 800 W. Montgomery Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19122

and

CRAIG WHITE, individually and in his official capacity as Chief Executive Officer of the Philadelphia Gas:
Works, having a main office located at 800 W. Montgomery Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19122

and

JOSEPH CIPPARONE, individually

and in his official capacity as
Union representative at the
the Philadelphia Gas Works, having
a main office located at
800 W. Montgomery Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19122

and

JERRY GADOSH, individually and in his official capacity as Supervisor the Philadelphia Gas Works, having a main office located at 800 W. Montgomery Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19122

and

MICHAEL HUDSON, individually and in his official capacity as Union Representative at the Philadelphia Gas Works, having a main office located at 800 W. Montgomery Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19122

Defendants

## COMPLAINT JURISDICTION, VENUE AND PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff brings this action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, as amended by §1981a (hereinafter, "Title VII"), 42 U. S. C. §1983 and §1988. Jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 and §1343. The Court's Pendent jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to 28 USC §1367(a).
- 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) inasmuch as Plaintiffs' causes of action arose in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and all the Defendants are found in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

- Plaintiff JOSEPH DEAN (hereinafter "Joseph Dean") is a White adult male individual presently aged 49 years old and a citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania residing at 3331 Edgemont Street, Philadelphia, PA 19134.
- Plaintiff PATRICIA DEAN (hereinafter "Patricia Dean") is a White adult female individual and a citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania residing at 3331 Edgemont Street, Philadelphia, PA 19134.
- 5. JOSEPH and PATRICIA DEAN are husband and wife.
- 6. Defendant PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS (hereinafter "PGW") is a Corporation owned and operated by the City of Philadelphia, a municipal government unit in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having a main office located at 800 West Montgomery Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122. At all times material hereto, Defendant PGW acted or failed to act under color and authority of law, and for and on behalf of the City of Philadelphia, a municipal corporation and government entity, and is directly and vicariously liable for the individual and joint acts and failures to act of the below-referenced Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, GADOSH and HUDSON.
- 7. Defendant PGW is an "employer" engaged in an industry affecting commerce as defined by 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(b) and employs in excess of 500 employees.
- 8. Defendant Craig WHITE (hereinafter "WHITE") is a White male and Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") of Defendant PGW, having a main office located at 800 West Montgomery Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122. At all times material hereto, Defendant PGW acted or failed to act under color and authority of law, and for and on behalf of the City of Philadelphia, a municipal corporation and

- government entity. Defendant White is sued individually and in his official capacity as CEO of Defendant PGW.
- 9. Defendant Joseph CIPPARONE (hereinafter "CIPPARONE") is a White male Union representative at Defendant PGW, having a main office located at 800 West Montgomery Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122. Defendant Cipparone is sued individually and in his official capacity as Union Representative at Defendant PGW.
- 10. Defendant MICHAEL HUDSON, (hereinafter "HUDSON") is a White male Specialist and Union representative at Defendant PGW, having a main office located at 800 West Montgomery Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122. Defendant Hudson is sued individually and in his official capacity as Specialist at Defendant PGW.
- 11. Defendant JERRY GADOSH (hereinafter "GADOSH") is a White male Supervisor at Defendant PGW, having a main office located at 800 West Montgomery Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122. Defendant Gadosh is sued individually and in his official capacity as Supervisor at Defendant PGW.
- 12. At all times material hereto, Defendant PGW acted or failed to act through its authorized agents, servants, workmen and employees including, but not limited to, Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, GADOSH and HUDSON, individually and/or jointly, who were at all times then and there acting within the course and scope of their employment, with Defendant PGW, and under color of law.
- 13. At all times material hereto, Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, GADOSH and HUDSON, individually and/or jointly, were acting in the course and scope of their

- agency and/or employment with and on behalf of and/or under the management, control and/or direction of Defendant PGW.
- 14. At all times material hereto, the individual Defendants were acting intentionally, maliciously, and in reckless disregard of the Plaintiff's right to be free from race discrimination and retaliation.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES**

- 15. Plaintiff filed a first Charge of discrimination, based on race discrimination and retaliation, against the Defendant PGW with the District Office of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Charge No. 530 2019 00771 on 21 February 2019.
- 16. Plaintiff also received a Notice of Right to Sue Within 90 Days from the U. S.

  Department of Justice dated 16 July 2019. A copy of the Notice of Right to Sue" is attached and marked as Exhibit "A".
- 17. Because of continued retaliation and harassment, Plaintiff filed a second Charge of Discrimination, based on retaliation, against the Defendant PGW, with the District Office of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Charge No. 530 2019 04434 on June 28, 2019.
- 18. However, because 180 days have not elapsed since the June 28, 2019 filing of the second Charge of Discrimination under Charge No. 530 2019 04434, the District Office of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has not completed its investigation and has not issued the Plaintiff a Right to Sue letter. Thus, the Plaintiff is awaiting a Right to Sue letter under Charge Number 530 2019 04434.

#### **BACKGROUND ALLEGATIONS**

19. Although Plaintiff Joseph Dean is White and Defendants White, Cipparone, Gadosh and Hudson are also White, said Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff Joseph Dean in the terms and condition of his employment because of his association with Black PGW employees, members of a protected group, and retaliated against him when he complained about and reported another employee's (Dylan Rutledge's) frequent use of racial slurs and epithets against Black people, which Plaintiff Joseph Dean found harmful, offensive and repugnant.

#### **GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 20. Plaintiff Joseph Dean was hired by Defendant PGW as a Helper on or about December 11, 2017.
- 21. One of the Plaintiff's co-workers, Dylan Rutledge, who also worked as a Helper, frequently used racial slurs in reference to Black co-workers and Black people in general and was known among other employees as a person who frequently used such racial slurs.
- 22. Plaintiff Joseph Dean found Mr. Rutledge's racial slurs against Black people offensive and harmful, and complained to Defendant Cipparone, Plaintiff Joseph Dean's Union Representative, about Mr. Rutledge's use of racial slurs, but Defendant Cipparone did nothing and took no action against Mr. Rutledge.
- 23. When Mr. Rutledge learned that Plaintiff Dean had complained about him, Mr. Rutledge called Plaintiff Joseph Dean a "Nigger Lover" in or about July 2018.
- 24. Two weeks later, Plaintiff Joseph Dean complained to Mr. Ryan Baldwin, a Black

- Supervisor.
- 25. After Plaintiff Joseph Dean complained to Supervisor Baldwin, he was contacted by Human Resources in August 2018 and told that Defendant PGW would investigate the matter.
- 26. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Rutledge was terminated from his employment with Defendant PGW.

#### INITIAL RETALIATION AND HOSTILE WORK ENVIRONMENT.

- 27. After Mr. Rutledge was terminated, Defendants Cipparone and Hudson retaliated against Plaintiff Joseph Dean, who treated him with hostility and made efforts to have other employees ostracize him.
- 28. For example, when Plaintiff Joseph Dean attended a cadet training class on or about September 11, 2018, Defendants Cipparone and Hudson publicly denounced and ostracized Plaintiff Joseph Dean to other employees as a "rat" while pointing at him.
- 29. On or about September 21, 2018, Plaintiff Joseph Dean was directed to attend a meeting with Defendant PGW's Chief Executive Officer, Defendant Craig White, Defendant Cipparone and Defendant Hudson.
- 30. While in the meeting, Defendants Hudson and Cipparone falsely accused Plaintiff Joseph Dean of wrong-doing.
- 31. During that meeting, Defendant White told Plaintiff Joseph Dean that he was a disgrace to the white race.
- 32. On or about October 30, 2018, Plaintiff Joseph Dean filed with Defendant PGW a written complaint of discrimination describing the hostile work environment and

- retaliation to which he had been subjected.
- 33. Within one hour after filing his written complaint, Defendant PGW retaliated against Plaintiff Joseph Dean by terminating him from his employment.

#### CONTINUED RETALIATION AND HARASSMENT POST TERMINATION

- 34. After Plaintiff Joseph Dean was terminated from his employment, and located new employment, Defendant PGW's employees, workmen and agents, including Defendants Gadosh and Hudson and other PGW employees, continued to harass and retaliate against Plaintiff Joseph Dean.
- 35. For example, since December 2018, unidentified PGW employees came to Plaintiff Joseph Dean's neighborhood in PGW vans and parked them next to his house for hours even though they had no work in the area; and those unidentified PGW employees would pretend to shoot him with a "finger-gun".
- 36. Plaintiff Joseph Dean, by and through his attorney, complained to Defendant PGW about the continued harassment, and asked it to stop the harassment, it only worsened.
- 37. On many occasions, and as late as June 12, 2019, Defendant Gadosh has followed Plaintiff from his home to his new place of employment in Montgomery County for no other reason than to harass and intimidate Plaintiff Joseph Dean.
- 38. On many occasions since Plaintiff Joseph Dean filed his first Charge of Discrimination in February 2019, Defendant Hudson has harassed the Plaintiff by telephone by calling him and making threats against the Plaintiff's life, and on other occasions by leaving voice mails consisting of heavy breathing.
- 39. In light of the continued harassment and retaliation, Plaintiff Joseph Dean filed

- another Charge of Discrimination with the District Office of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Charge No. 530 2019 04434, in on June 28, 2019.
- 40. As a direct and proximate result of the acts and failures to act as described above, Plaintiff Joseph Dean experienced, *inter alia*, mental and physical pain and anguish and was unable to give his wife services, society, conjugal affection, company and consortium to his wife, Plaintiff Patricia Dean.

#### FEDERAL CLAIMS

## COUNT I: Plaintiff Joseph Dean -v- Defendant Philadelphia Gas Works (Violation to Title VII, 42 USC §2000e-2(a)(1)

- 41. The allegations in all preceding paragraphs are incorporated and made part of this paragraph as if fully set forth here.
- 42. The acts and/or failures to act of Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant PGW, discriminated against Plaintiff Joseph Dean in the terms and conditions of his employment and denied him of rights and/or protections secured to him by the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.
- 43. The acts and failures to act of Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant PGW, discriminated against Plaintiff Joseph Dean on the basis of his race and constituted an unlawful employment practice in violation of 42 U. S. C. 2000e-1.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Joseph Dean demands judgment against the

Philadelphia Gas Works in a sum in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for attorney's fees as allowed by 42 U. S. C. §1988.

## COUNT II: Plaintiff Joseph Dean -v- Defendant Philadelphia Gas Works (Violation of Title VII, 42 §USC 2000e-2(a)(2)

- 44. The allegations in all preceding paragraphs are incorporated and made part of this paragraph as if fully set forth here.
- 45. The acts and/or failures to act of Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant PGW, discriminated against Plaintiff Joseph Dean by serving to limit, segregate and classify him in a way which deprived him of employment opportunities and adversely affected his status as an employee because of his race.
- 46. The acts and failures to act of Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant PGW, discriminated against Plaintiff Joseph Dean on the basis of his race and constituted an unlawful employment practice in violation of 42 U. S. C. 2000e-2(a)(2).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Joseph Dean demands judgment against the Philadelphia Gas Works in a sum in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for attorney's fees as allowed by 42 U. S. C. §1988.

## COUNT III: Plaintiff Joseph Dean -v- Defendant Philadelphia Gas Works (Violation of Title VII, 42 U. S. C. §2000(e)-3(a))

- 47. The Allegations contained in all preceding Paragraphs are here incorporated and included by reference as if fully set forth here.
- 48. The acts and failures to act of Defendant WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly, specifically the acts of falsely accusing Plaintiff Joseph Dean of wrong-doing, subjecting him to harassment and ostracizing, and calling him vile names and accusing him of being a disgrace to his race, retaliated against Plaintiff Joseph Dean for filing reports of race discrimination and harassment with Defendant PGW.
- 49. The acts and failures to act of Defendant WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant PGW, constituted an unlawful employment practice proscribed by 42 U. S. C. §2000e-3(a).
- 50. As a result of Defendant WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH's individual and/or joint actions, and therefore Defendant PGW's actions, Plaintiff Joseph Dean has and may be impaired in his employment opportunities, and has suffered loss of income, loss of professional stature, mental anguish, embarrassment, humiliation, and loss of self-esteem in violation of 42 U. S. C. §2000(e)-3(a).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Joseph Dean prays for Judgment against the defendant named in this Count, individually and/or jointly, for damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 42

USC §1988.

## Count IV: Plaintiff Joseph Dean -v- Defendants Philadelphia Gas Works, White, Cipparone, Hudson and Gadosh, Individually And/or Jointly. (Violation of 42 U. S. C. §1983, 1st and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments)

- 51. The Allegations contained in all preceding Paragraphs are here incorporated and included by reference as if fully set forth here.
- 52. Defendants Philadelphia Gas Works, White, Cipparone, Hudson and Gadosh, individually and/or jointly, acted under color of law, and with deliberate indifference to Plaintiff Joseph Dean's rights to be free from race discrimination and retaliatory conduct by Defendant PGW's employees.
- 53. Defendant PGW failed to adequately train, supervise and instruct Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly, in the illegality and impropriety of retaliating against employees for reporting incidents of race discrimination.
- 54. Defendant Philadelphia Gas Works is strictly liable for the acts and failures to act of Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly.
- 55. As a result of said failure to train, supervise and instruct Defendant WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly, who then subjected Plaintiff Joseph Dean to race discrimination and retaliation as described herein, the Plaintiff was deprived of his rights under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.
- 56. As a result of the Defendants' individual and/or joint actions, Plaintiff Joseph

  Dean has and may be impaired in his employment opportunities, and has

suffered loss of income, loss of professional stature, mental anguish, embarrassment, humiliation, and loss of self-esteem in violation of 42 U. S. C. §1983.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Joseph Dean prays for Judgment against the Defendants named in this Count, individually and/or jointly, for damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 42 USC §1988(b).

#### STATE LAW CLAIMS: JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

## COUNT V: Plaintiff Joseph Dean -v- Defendant Philadelphia Gas Works (Violation of 42 Pa. C. S. §955(a))

- 57. The allegations in all preceding paragraphs are incorporated and made part of this paragraph as if fully set forth here.
- 58. Plaintiff Joseph Dean was the best able and most competent to perform his services as a Helper for Defendant Philadelphia Gas Works, which services he had performed for almost two years.
- 59. The acts and failures to act of Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant PGW, tended to discriminate against Plaintiff Joseph Dean with respect to compensation, hire, tenure, terms, conditions or privileges of his employment on the basis of his race.
- 60. The acts and failures to act of Defendants WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, individually and/or jointly, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant PGW, constituted an unfair employment practice proscribed by 42 Pa.

C. S. §955(a).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Joseph Dean demands judgment against Defendant Philadelphia Gas Works in a sum in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for any and all costs, filing fees and attorney fees as may be allowed by law.

## COUNT VI: Plaintiff Joseph Dean -v- Defendants Philadelphia Gas Works, White, Cipparone, Hudson and Gadosh, Individually And/or Jointly. 43 Pa. C. S. §955(d)

- 61. The averments set forth in all preceding paragraphs are here incorporated here as if fully set forth here.
- 62. 43 Pa. C. S. §955(d) proscribes any person or employer from discriminating in any manner against any individual because such individual has opposed any practice forbidden by this act, or because such individual has made a charge, testified or assisted, in any manner, in any investigation, proceeding or hearing under this act.
- 63. The Defendants, individually and jointly, intentionally and willfully discriminated and retaliated against Plaintiff Joseph Dean because he opposed discriminatory practices forbidden by 43 Pa. C. S. §955 and made a charge against the Defendants with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission, all in violation of 43 Pa. C. S. §955(d).
- 64. As a result of the conduct of the defendants, Plaintiff Joseph Dean has suffered a loss of employment and income, loss of professional stature, mental anguish, embarrassment, humiliation, and loss of self-esteem.
  - WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Joseph Dean prays for Judgment against all the

defendants, individually and/or jointly, for damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty

Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for reasonable attorney's fees as allowed by law.

# COUNT VII: PLAINTIFF PATRICIA DEAN -v- DEFENDANTS PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS, WHITE, CIPPARONE, HUDSON and GADOSH, INDIVIDUALLY and/or JOINTLY (Loss of Consortium)

- 65. The averments set forth in all preceding paragraphs are here incorporated here as if fully set forth here.
- 66. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants individual and joint discrimination against her husband, Plaintiff Joseph Dean, he experienced, *inter alia*, mental and physical pain and anguish and was unable to give company and consortium to Plaintiff Patricia Dean.
- 67. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' individual and joint actions,
  Plaintiff Patricia Dean was deprived of and lost, *inter alia*, Plaintiff Joseph Dean's
  services, society, conjugal affection, companionship and consortium, contrary to
  her marital expectations.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Patricia Dean prays for Judgment against all the defendants, individually and/or jointly, for damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for reasonable attorney's fees as allowed by law.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin V. Mincey, Esquire Isaac H. Green, Esquire

MINCEY FITZPATRICK ROSS, LLC Attorneys and Counselors at Law Two Penn Center 1500 JFK Boulevard, Suite 1525

Philadelphia, PA 19102 Telephone: 215 - 587 - 0006 Telefax: 215 - 587 - 0628

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Joseph and Patricia Dean